

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 10 2006

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in the present application. Applicants respectfully submit that each of the claims is allowable without amendment.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for indicating the allowable subject matter in claims 3, 5-6, and 19-21.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 13-14, and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as assertedly being anticipated by Danko (U.S. Patent No. 6,879,391 B1, hereinafter "Danko") in view of Feldman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,595,289, hereinafter "Feldman"). Claims 8-12 and 15-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as assertedly being unpatentable over Danko in view of Applicants' admitted prior art. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 1, as originally filed, is directed to a method for inspection of periodic structures on a lithography mask and specifically recites, "calibrating a first image of each array structure for selected locations on the lithography mask." The Office Action states that "Danko teaches ... calibrating a first image of each array structure for selected locations." and refers to Figure 1 of the Danko reference. Figure 1 of Danko is a system diagram that does not teach or suggest calibrating a first image of each array structure. Furthermore, the Danko reference in its entirety does not teach or suggest calibrating a first image of an array structure.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the references of record.

Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Claim 7, as originally filed, recites "inspecting the lithography mask, wherein the inspecting comprises calibrating a first image of each array structure for selected locations on the lithography mask." As explained herein above, the Danko reference does not teach or suggest calibrating a first image of an array structure.

Claim 7 further recites "repairing the lithography mask based upon results of the inspecting." Neither the Danko nor the Feldman reference, taken individually or in combination, teach or suggest repairing the structure being inspected. The Office Action, in the argument regarding claim 14, asserts, that "Danko discloses repairing the lithography mask based upon the results of inspecting." To support this point, the Office Action refers to the inspection camera 25 in Figure 1 of the Danko reference. The inspection camera 25, however, is in no way capable of repairing a lithography mask based on the results of inspecting. The references simply do not teach these limitations.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 7 is allowable over the references of record.

Claims 8-12 depend from claim 7 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Claim 13 recites "wherein the inspecting comprises calibrating a first image of each array structure for selected locations on the lithography mask." As explained herein above, the Danko reference does not teach or suggest calibrating a first image of an array structure.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 13 is allowable over the references of record.

Claims 14-21 depend from claim 13 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Ira S. Matsil, Applicants' attorney, at 972-732-1001 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. No fee is believed due in connection with this filing. However, should one be deemed due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

Respectfully submitted,



Ira S. Matsil
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 35,272

10/10/06
Date
Slater & Matsil, L.L.P.
17950 Preston Rd.
Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas 75252
Tel.: 972-732-1001
Fax: 972-732-9218